



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/798,698

03/10/2004

Lior Levy

P18439

6162

46915

7590

05/15/2009

KONRAD RAYNES & VICTOR, LLP.

ATTN: INT77

315 SOUTH BEVERLY DRIVE, SUITE 210

BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212

EXAMINER

MAI, KEVIN S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2456

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/15/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

krvuspto@ipmatters.com

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/798,698	Applicant(s) LEVY ET AL.	
	Examiner KEVIN S. MAI	Art Unit 2456	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) KEVIN S. MAI. (3) David Victor (reg no.39867).

(2) Yasin Barqadle. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 07 May 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: 2005/0058063 to Masuyama et al. and 6381218 to McIntyre et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed the current rejection with applicants. Explained how Masuyama and McIntyre were being combined. Went over which features were disclosed by Masuyama and which features were disclosed by McIntyre. Applicant said they would consider what was said and that they will inform examiner if they decide to file a supplemental amendment.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Yasin M Barqadle/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2456	
---	--